

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/904,705	07/12/2001	Stuart E. Ralston	2240P136	4758
7	590 06/10/2004	EXAMINER		
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP			CHERRY, STEPHEN J	
Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire	Boulevard		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030			2863	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			_Aiv
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ια.
Advisory Action	09/904,705	RALSTON ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
TI MAIL DIO DATE ALLE	Stephen J. Cherry	2863	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		•	
THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the appropertion of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 29 April 2004. Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	ellant's Brief must be filed within	•	in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to the affidavit, because the Hakala et al claim 2 discloses the same patentable invention as claim 1 of the application, an affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131 is not appropriate.

john Berlow Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800